DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 216 647 HE 015 114

AUTHOR Mosqueda, Lawrence J.; And Others
TITLE The Persistence of Institutional Racism in Higher Education: Its Roots and Remedies.
PUB DATE 5 Sep 81
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (New York, NY, September 5, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Policy; Case Studies; Comparative Education; Cultural Context; *Educational History; Government Role; *Higher Education; *Minority Groups; Personnel Policy; *Political Influences; Political Science; *Racial Discrimination; Social Class; Sociocultural Patterns
IDENTIFIERS *Mosqueda (Lawrence); *Munoz (Carlos); University of Denver CO; University of Washington

ABSTRACT

An overview of the historical roots of racism is presented, and the role of higher education within the institutional structure of American society is analyzed. Two case studies are reviewed in detail, along with the relevant political issues and change strategies to help remedy racism in America. A key dimension of racism involves education, which has been viewed as a means for social progress in the United States. Higher education institutions have in the past systematically excluded women, blacks, Chicanos, and other unfavored groups from entry as students and in the professional labor market. American universities are distinguished from most of those of Western Europe by bureaucratic, lay control over university policies, the dependence of universities on business and government funds, and a lack of a strong professional and ethical tradition among academics. Originally, American university curricula were expected to reflect aristocratic values and culture and have consequently emphasized a classical curriculum geared to the perceived needs of upper class and upper-middle class students. In addition, unlike Europe, no tradition of academic freedom for students developed in the United States. A neutral model of teaching resulted in American academics spending their classroom time on contemporary liberal-conservative debate rather than proposing social alternatives and criticism. The specific situation in the political science department and the cases of Carlos Munoz at the University of Washington, Seattle, and Lawrence Mosqueda at the University of Denver are examined. A bibliography is appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

MAY - 4 1982

ED216647

THE PERSISTENCE OF INSTITUTIONAL RACISM IN HIGHER EDUCATION: ITS ROOTS AND REMEDIES

by

Lawrence J. Mosqueda
Department of Political Science
University of Colorado at Denver

Philip Meranto
Urban Studies Department
College of Wooster
Wooster, Ohio

Dennis Judd
Political Science Department
University of Denver

Matthew Lippman
Political Science Department
University of Denver

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lawrence J. Mosqueda

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Prepared for Presentation at the 1981 Annual
American Political Science Association Convention
September 5, 1981
New York City

H 2015 114

I. Racism in America: The Role of Education

Few issues continue to tear at the fabric of American society as much as racism and its consequences. Despite numerous attempts to eliminate this social disease from American culture, current information suggests that not only has racism persisted but that in some respects it has deepened and is threatening to become even more socially destructive.[1]

Over the past two decades an avalanche of social science research and popular writings have analyzed racism in America from every conceivable angle.[2] This mountain of data has produced, however, an ironic outcome. One of the leading experts in the field has observed that while recent research on race relations has never been so substantial and relevant, it is "quickly followed up with social action and policy that run directly against the major grain of research."[3] An important instance of this was the Kerner Commission Report of 1967, which did not result in policy responses consistent with the Commission's recommendations.[4]

This paper will attempt to illustrate why this pattern persists, particularly as it relates to racism in higher education. This relationship is summarized through two case studies of how institutional racism has been manifested in political science departments at two major universities. Educational institutions, including universities, have not been free of problems associated with personal and institutional racism. In fact, most of the debates of the last decade have involved busing, segregation in the public schools, and affirmative action programs in institutions of higher education. It is notable that the two landmark cases on affirmative action involved universities.[5] In general, our analysis indicates that while relevant information on racism is essential in the struggle to eliminate it, information alone is not a sufficient remedy. Racism, as we illustrate below, is rooted in a "web of power relationships" which carry with them unfair advantages and privileges in life for some, and

disadvantages and exploitation for others. Those humans who benefit from the advantages and privileges have developed sophisticated (and sometimes not so sophisticated) institutional and structural rationalizations for their superior positions, and have utilized a wide variety of forceful measures when necessary to maintain their superior status.[6] Thus, if racism is to be overcome in American society, information must be transformed into political lessons which can help guide organized efforts to dismantle racist power relationships and the advantages which flow from them. This paper is a modest attempt to contribute to this process.

In order to appreciate how institutional racism has developed in higher education, we provide an overview of the historical roots of racism in general. We then analyze the role of higher education within the institutional structure of American society. Our two specific case studies follow. Finally, we attempt to summarize the relevant political lessons from this experience and suggest some future lines of action to help remedy racism in America.

II. The Historical Roots of Racism

Racism is often portrayed as part of "human nature," as a trait which is inherently part of the human species. Actually there is little or no evidence to suggest that racism has always existed -- certainly a requirement for the concept of "human nature." While aspects of ethnocentrism have played important parts of what is often called recorded history, racism has not been demonstrated to be a universal phenomenon.

Before proceeding it is perhaps useful to have a definition of racism as it is utilized here. Carmichael and Hamilton's definition has proved useful: "Predication of decisions and policies on considerations of race for the purpose of subordinating a racial group and maintaining control over that group."[7] The

group which engages in the subordination reaps benefits. Thus in American society the racist notion of white superiority -- non-white inferiority -- carries specific privileges for whites, and specific disadvantages for non-whites, as both groups attempt to pursue life.

Banton and Harwood trace the "intellectual" "scientific" development of using race or skin color for the basis for differentiating between peoples to the publication of Edward Long's History of Jamaica in 1774. The plantation owner Long was able to "scientifically" assess blacks because he owned slaves and was thus able to directly observe them. He argued that blacks were a different and inferior species from whites and that "race mixing was poisonous and dangerous to civilization."[8]

Banton and Harwood's research adds to that already available which strongly indicates that the rise of racism, as we know it today, was concomitantly and/or causally related to the development of capitalism, as a socio-economic system which first emerged in Europe and in the United States. Authors such as James and Grace Boggs,[9] Thomas Almaguer,[10] Robert Blauner,[11] and Eric Williams[12] among others persuasively demonstrate this linkage between the development of capitalism and racism.

For example, Almaguer and Boggs illustrate, in their separate writings, how the systematic oppression of blacks and Native Americans played an important role in the accumulation of capital and in the economic growth of America and how racism played a role in the justification of that accumulation.

The authors see five main steps in this linkage process, especially in the European and American colonial period:[13]

1. Capitalism as a mode of production is one that must expand and accumulate capital. Once European capitalism reached a certain stage of development it was necessary for it to expand overseas in order to continue its development. Lenin

identified this latter stage as imperialism and linked it to the colonization of non-white Europeans. The expansion outside of Europe than became viewed as necessary rather than a political option.

2. There was a need to transform the indigenous masses of the colonized world into an effective workforce. These largely non-European peoples' cultures and lives were expendable to the needs of the dominant white Europeans. Native populations which could not be effectively harnessed (such as in North America) were eliminated; native populations which were surplus or needed elsewhere (such as Africans) were enslaved to work land stolen from others.

3. In order to justify this exploitation, there was developed, as Almaguer notes, "an elaborate system of racial and in some cases, religious ideology."[14] Boggs notes that the need for a justification helped the slave traders (and those who subsequently benefited) to convince themselves that there had never been any African culture, even as the slave trade destroyed that culture. There was even the view that white Europeans had done black Africans a favor by bringing them to a new Christian environment.[15]

4. In order to strengthen the justification and cultural superiority of the conquering group, it was necessary to destroy the native culture, values and traditions.[16] For example, the first Bishop of Mexico, Zumarraga, burned the library, artifacts, and documents of the native population at Texcoco. This act was not merely the act of a religious zealot, but also an attempt to consolidate political powers and to deny and disregard the previous native existence.

5. The maintenance of control became not only a matter of destroying old institutions, but building new and dominant institutions that "maintain the relationship of power and privileges."[17] Forms of control vary in time and place and in degrees of force. Direct force such as the military and police are obvious in their use. While they are still used today, they are less efficient in the

long run for systems maintenance. "Non-forceful" methods such as religion, schools, and universities can be useful and more efficient in maintaining control. The last non-forceful method is relatively new for minorities as this institution has long been denied to them.

This brief description is an overview of a process that was at times subtle but more often brutal in its development. A key dimension of this process involves the utilization of racism within the education function. Education has always been viewed as a panacea for social progress in the United States. As a consequence, public schools as well as institutions of higher learning are, in the popular view, the magic elixir that transforms a disadvantaged group into a successful cultural example. Given this cultural definition, then the denial of education to minorities is an important mechanism for holding them back, and it provides the opportunity to "blame the victims" for their own failures.

Specifically, institutions of higher education have, in the past, systematically excluded women, blacks, Chicanos, and other unfavored groups from both entry as students, and employment. These historical patterns are evident in almost all universities. Under-enrollment of these groups as students means that they will later be under represented in the professions which carry status, higher pay, and socio-economic power.

III. The Development of Higher Education in America

Any discussion of strategies to combat racism in higher education must be based upon an appreciation of a number of unique characteristics of American universities.[18]

In Europe, the academic enterprise preceded the founding of formal universities. Academics taught students on a fee basis and academics' livelihood

depended upon their personal appeal and expertise. If the academics perceived that a town was becoming inhospitable or overly restrictive, the academics went on strike or moved elsewhere. Gradually, formal universities developed as guilds of faculty and students who, despite religious patronage, exercised democratic control over their university.[19]

In contrast, American universities and colleges preceded the academic enterprise. American colleges and universities, with some significant exceptions, were founded by small denominational sects which viewed the universities as vehicles through which to propagate their religious views, train ministers and educate their brethren. These small and financially weak institutions were forced to look quite early in their development to government and business assistance. Thus, the American academic was from the beginning an instrument for serving sectarian interests, and academics' professional activity and conduct also was constrained from the beginning by the expectations of government and business.

The original American institutions of higher learning were organized according to the Protestant religious model of lay control over the clergy. Originally, Boards of Trustees generally were composed of clergy and governmental officials who ran the universities. Gradually, with the growth of corporate enterprise, the Boards came to be dominated by business interests. The Trustees, preoccupied with their own businesses, found adminstering colleges and universities time-consuming and began to delegate their powers to university presidents selected by the Trustees from the world of business and government. Presidents, in turn, tended to delegate their powers to bureaucrats whose primary loyalty was to the institution and whose bureaucratic functions, in many cases. were only loosely related to the academic enterprise.

Business penetration of the American college and university increased in the

late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. For instance, the founder of Standard Oil donated thirty-four million dollars to the University of Chicago; railroad tycoon Leland H. Stanford's estate provided twenty-four million dollars for Stanford University; and the Duke family gave Duke University a comparable contribution. Rockefeller, Carnegie and Harkness also poured vast sums into the development of universities.[20] Boards of Trustees became totally dominated by corporate interests who invested university funds in the corporate world and who involved universities in independent profit-making enterprises.[21] Not surprisingly, at the instigation of corporate donors and trustees, business, engineering and more practically based curriculums were introduced.

As government regulation of business developed and as American business activity spread abroad, government, as well as corporate funds began to be directed into the university. Major universities became heavily involved with and dependent upon government contracts and academics began to divide their careers between the university and the government.[22] State universities were developed in the early nineteenth century as conscious instruments of governmental-business interests to promote and improve agriculture, mining, oil exploration, forestry and other economic activities.

In addition to bureaucratic, lay control over university policies and the dependence of universities upon business and governmental funds, American universities are distinguished from most of their Western European counterparts by their lack of a strong professional and ethical tradition among academics.

Initially, American academics tended to be "tutors" who remained in academia for a short period of time and then resumed their studies for the ministry. For instance, Harvard had been established for more than eighty-five years, Yale for more than fifty and Princeton for more than twenty years before each had its first professor and it was many more years before regular professors outnumbered

transient tutors in American universities.[23] Since the academic staff tended to be young tutors they were denied a role in university administration and, as a result, no strong tradition of academic self-government developed in the United States. American academics eventually won the right to participate in such things as hiring and termination decisions and won the right to control student grades and examinations. But American academics, by and large, have never won the right to exercise democratic control over their universities and have remained employees of the university corporation.

Originally American university curriculums were expected to reflect aristocratic values and culture and consequently universities emphasized a classical curriculum geared to the perceived needs of upper class and upper-middle class students. As previously stated, the penetration of universities by business resulted in the curriculum's reflecting a more utilitarian orientation. However, in both instances, teaching tended to be conducted by the rote method and there was little scope for innovation in the classroom. At the same time, university libraries generally were too inadequate to permit the students and staff to engage in independent learning and intellectual exploration. As late as 1846 only sixteen institutions had a library of more than 10,000 volumes and college libraries of 1,000 volumes were by no means rare.[24] In fact, faculty research, which might encourage the independent exploration for knowledge, also was discouraged in American universities until the late nineteenth century. In 1857, a committee of the Columbia College Board of Trustees observed that the sorry state of the college might be due to the fact that three professors "wrote books."[25]

In addition, unlike Europe, no tradition of academic freedom for students developed in the United States. American students were generally viewed both by the administrators and by the faculty as irresponsible, and as impressionistic.

This negative view of students' capabilities combined with the obvious political constraints on academics to create an expectation that academics would present both sides of all questions and remain "neutral" in the classroom. This neutral model of teaching is distinct from the classroom model that was common in universities in countries such as Italy where the faculty was expected to argue, convince and persuade students of the validity of the faculty member's viewpoint. Given the diversity of academic opinion which existed in Italian universities, it was felt that this "adversarial model" would afford students an opportunity to consider and reach a fully informed opinion. The "neutral model" of teaching in American universities resulted in American academics spending their classroom time outlining the contemporary liberal-conservative debate rather than proposing meaningful social alternatives and criticisms.

Outside the classroom, American faculty members as employee-representatives of an academic institution had little more freedom than they had inside the classroom. Faculty members who were virtually all white, middle class males were deemed to have a special duty to refrain from conduct and speech which reflected badly on their institution or which involved them in commenting upon questions which were outside their "professional competence" or which could not be answered based upon empirical evidence.

Given the constraints placed upon academics in the United States, it is not surprising that energetic and independently minded individuals often tended to leave (and were forced out of on occasion) the university to seek employment in the expanding American industrial economy. The less ambitious and creative individuals were attracted to and remained in academia.

As professional graduate education developed in the United States in the early twentieth century, and the number of Ph.D.s increased, an academic job came to depend upon receipt of a degree from a select number of graduate institutions.

Academic recruitment often was carried out through an "old (white) boys network" which perpetuated tenured white males' control over academic positions. Occasionally, a politically controversial figure managed to obtain a position, but the historical record indicates that such individuals were and are quickly terminated or, if fortunate, exiled to a small, liberal arts college.

Consider the well-known academic liberals dismissed during the last decades of the nineteenth century:

> Dr. George M. Steele, President of Lawrence College, for leaning "toward free trade and greenbacks" (1892); the dismissal of President H. E. Stockbridge of North Dakota Agricultural College for "political" reasons (1893); the trial of Richard T. Ely, professor of economics at Wisconsin, for heretical social and economic writings (1894); the dismissal of Docent I.A. Hourwich of the University of Chicago, for participating in a Populist Convention (1894); the dismissal of Edward W. Bemis, economist, from the University of Chicago, for championing antimonopoly views (1895); the dismissal of James Allen Smith, political scientist, from Marietta College, for "antimonopoly teaching" (1897); the attack upon President E. Benjamin Andrews of Brown University for having promulgated views favorable to free silver, and his eventual resignation (1897); the dismissal of John R. Commons, economist, from Indiana University because of his economic views (1896), and the withdrawal of support from his chair at Syracuse University for the same reason (1899); the removal of Frank Parsons and Bemis from the Kansas State Agricultural College because of their "positions on economic questions" (1899); the forced resignation of President Henry Wade Rogers from Northwestern University for his opposition to imperialism (1900); the dismissal of Edward A. Ross from Stanford University for his opinions on silver and coolie immigration.[26]

It was the unadventurous and insecure academics of the early era and their proteges, products of the "old (white) boys network," who began to protect themselves against the vagaries of the economy and from competition from job candidates newly emerging from graduate schools by developing tenure plans. The AAUP, whose membership initially was limited to faculty who had taught for ten years and which was, according to Hofstadter, "a union of the aristocrats of academic labor," focused their efforts upon protecting the jobs of senior faculty while paying limited attention to the protections accorded to potential job applicants and to junior faculty.[27]

When tenure and hiring decisions have been subject to legal challenge on the grounds of racism, sexism and political bias, these faculty, by and large, have been able to insulate themselves from legal accountability by utilizing the legal defenses and fictions of lack of "state action," reliance upon "sovereign immunity," claims of the plaintiff's failure to "exhaust administrative remedies" and by arguing for judicial deference to "academic expertise."

Thus, the American academic has and is a dependent employee of a university bureaucracy linked to and dependent upon corporate interests. The myth of academic freedom masks the limited freedom accorded to university faculty inside and outside the classroom. As employees, the role of the American academic is to embody and articulate the prevailing ideologies, values and points of view and to train individuals to staff capitalist enterprise. The faculty role in legitimizing and perpetuating the prevailing social order is such that the systematic exclusion of all those who may question or challenge these beliefs -- political radicals and all but the politically safest racial and sexual minorities -- is then required.

This is particularly the case for political science departments. Teachers in these departments are employed primarily to instruct students in the prevailing ideology of the larger society and to explain why the American system of government and politics is the best possible in an imperfect world. Political radicals who attempt to challenge this outlook do not fare well, particularly if they attempt to put alternative views into political practice by associating with alternative political organizations. Thus, when potential faculty members are considered for positions in political sicence departments, their "qualifications" are assessed according to their adherence to traditional political views. Leading educators, such as Robert Hutchins, former resident of the University of Chicago, have argued that intellectuals with communist ideas, for example, should not be

on university faculties.

Individuals from racial minority backgrounds are immediately suspect on these grounds because of the history of racial rebellion in America. Minorities may be hired for university positions, but usually only if they accept and articulate the prevailing ideology of the dominant race. Minorities who challenge traditional political views are generally excluded on grounds that they are not qualified. Since assessment of qualifications is allegedly a highly subjective process, it is not difficult to achieve majority agreement among the tenured white male faculty to exclude anyone with "deviate" ideas.

Below we attempt to illustrate these general points by briefly examining two case studies which ahve taken place about ten years apart. The authors have been personally involved in these cases and have been struck by the similarities of the cases despite the decade and geographical distance that separates them. In each instance a well-qualified Chicano professor was denied a teaching position on the pretextual grounds that he was not "qualified."

IV. The Carlos Munoz Case at the University of Washington, Seattle

During the early 1970s, Kenneth Dolbeare was selected to chair and upgrade the Political Science Department at the University of Washington, Seattle. At that time Dolbeare was a member of the Caucus for a New Political Science and his chairmanship represented, in some respects, an opportunity to put into practice some of the educational philosophy of the Caucus. In part, Dolbeare's conception of the direction in which the Political Science Department should head was one which would reflect the reality of the American political culture. In order to understand, scientifically investigate, and teach to others the complexities of American politics, the Department should include qualified people from a wide

variety of experiences and perspectives. Since the Department was traditional in its makeup, that is, composed almost exclusively of white, middle-class males, Dolbeare made an effort to enrich the Department by recruiting women, minorities and white radicals at both the faculty and graduate student levels. The mixture of the more established members of the Department and these additional intellectual elements was envisioned to create an academic atmosphere that would encourage stimulating learning experiences, learning experiences that would particularly and more accurately reflect the variety of American political cultures. Through this interaction, it was thought that political science would be experienced in a new and more relevant manner by both faculty and students. Social conditions in the larger society of the time also suggested that this approach contained promise if higher education was to be helpful in resolving some of the social problems of the society. This was particularly the case relative to resolving the racial conflicts which rocked American society in the latter 1960s and early 1970s.

About midway through Dolbeare's effort to develop the department, he was forced to resign as chair when the University of Washington administration threatened to rescind a contract offered to a new faculty member because he was arrested in an anti-war desmonstration. Before he resigned, however, Dolbeare had successfully recruited a black, a Native American/Chicana woman on a half-time appointment, two white women, two white male radicals, and two white male liberals at the faculty level. He also gave leadership to recruiting an unusually large number of women and minority graduate students. One goal that was not achieved before Dolbeare's resignation was the attempt to hire a full-time Chicano faculty member. This was viewed as particularly important because of the large number of Chicanos on the West Coast and the Southwest and because of the emerging Chicano political movement at that time. It was reasoned that a first-rate political science department should have a specialist who could analyze and teach

this dimension of the discipline.

Consequently, the year following Dolbeare's resignation (1972) a departmental search was conducted to hire a faculty member in the area of American/urban politics who had a specialty in Chicano and ethnic politics. The leading candidate for the position was Dr. Carlos Munoz of the University of California at Irvine. At that time there were less than a dozen Chicano Ph.D.s in political science in the entire country, and Dr. Munoz was considered by many to be among the best qualified and promising. During his interview at the University of Washington, Dr. Munoz was enthusiastically received by several members of the Political Science faculty. The graduate students association, the undergraduate students association, and a coalition of community organizations overwhelmingly voted to hire him as an outstanding candidate for the job.

A departmental meeting was held on a Friday afternoon to vote on the position. The meeting was attended by over fifty people. After a two and one-half hour discussion of the pros and cons of hiring Munoz, a straw vote of all in the room was taken. It resulted in a 35 to 6 vote to offer Dr. Munoz a tenured position in the Political Science Department of the University of Washington. However, following that vote, a secret ballot "faculty only" vote was taken (12 to 4 against Dr. Munoz) and he was denied an offer for the job.

News of the secret results touched off demonstrations on the University of Washington campus during the following week. By mid-week, Chicanos and Native Americans from the large Seattle community, and Chicano/Native American students occupied the Dean's office. They were joined by other students and a few faculty members. During the occupation of the Dean's office, the demonstrators found a confidential letter to the Dean from the new chairman of the Political Science Department, Richard Flathman. In the letter, Flathman threatened to resign as chairman if Munoz were hired. He pictured Munoz as a radical who would foment

rebellion among students and the larger community. Flathman did not dispute the fact that Munoz was a well-qualified Chicano instructor; his objection centered on Munoz's political perspectives.

A negotiating session was held during the occupation of the Dean's office and in that session the Dean promised to initiate a nationwide search to hire a qualified Chicano faculty member. Ten years later the search has yet to be conducted and the Political Science Department at the University of Washington has yet to hire a full-time Chicano teaching faculty member. Several white males, however, have been hired over the past decade. An investigation by the U.S. Office of Civil Rights has found the Department guilty of discrimination against Munoz and another Chicano candidate, Armando Gutierrez. However, no sanctions have ever been leveled against the Department by the federal government although the University of Washington receives an enormous amount of federal aid.

During the dispute there were many statements made in the meeting by the faculty concerning the qualifications of Munoz. The arguments made against him included the notions that: (1) ethnic and Chicano politics were not really important aspects of political science, (2) such topics could be taught by anyone on the faculty if needed; there was no need for an expert, (3) writings and research in these areas tended to be "impressionistic," not scientific; therefore, anyone working in the area should not be given tenure, (4) these subject areas tended to attract community activists who would give the University a "bad image," (5) that Chicano students and community people could not judge the qualifications of a professional candidate, and (6) that a Chicano instructor might have trouble being objective about racial conflict in the society and being objective in his treatment of white students.

V. The Lawrence Mosqueda Case at the University of Denver

In July, 1978, Dennis Judd was brought to the University of Denver with the specific mandate to turn the Political Science Department around. It was considered a very weak Department; so much so that a faculty member outside the Department chaired the search, and several department chairmen participated in the interview process. The curriculum was in disarray; very few faculty had scholarly accomplishments and there had never been a tradition of funded research. Although the Department had once had a Master of Arts program, it had been given up because of inadequate faculty resources.

Within the first year of Dr. Judd's chairmanship, the Department produced a modern political science curriculum, and created a new honors program. A Departmental teaching evaluation instrument was adopted as well, as part of a concentrated effort to improve faculty teaching performance. Before the end of the first year, a research professor title was created, and individuals holding the title produced over $350,000 in research in two years. Dr. Judd also recruited several visiting faculty who brought scholarly visibility to the Department. These faculty contributed in very critical ways to the teaching program. Within a few months, Dr. Judd initiated stricter tenure and promotion procedures within the Department. In the fall of 1978, he wrote, and the Department adopted, the first Departmental tenure guidelines. Through faculty resignations and the addition of one position to the Department, a substantial change in the Department's personnel was certain. One new faculty member was recruited during the 1979-80 school year, and joined the faculty in September, 1980. Three more positions were to be filled by September, 1981. One of Dr. Judd's objectives was to create a diverse faculty and curriculum more representative of the variety of political views and cultural experiences in American society.

Throughout this process, numerous faculty meetings were held; no important decision was made without full participation. From time to time individual faculty expressed anxiety about the scope and pace of change. There was, for example, some opposition to the idea of instituting a M.A. program in public policy and urban affairs, but the University had funded a market survey for such a program, and the faculty had consented.

On September 22, 1980, the faculty of the Department of Political Science met to discuss the upcoming search for three faculty members, and to agree upon a job advertisement. All of the members of the faculty attended. After a tentative job advertisement was prepared, the Chairperson circulated the job description to all faculty, and asked for their comments.

The position was advertised in the October and November issues of the American Political Science Association Newsletter. The positions were also advertised with the Equal Opportunity Forum, and through letters sent to all individuals who might have special access to minority applicants. Two of the positions were advertised at the assistant professor (untenured) level, and one at a tenured associate professor level. The job advertisement specified that the Department would hire the three "best" individuals in three fields. However, the Department intended to maximize the probability that one candidate in each of three advertised specialties would be hired. This had been clearly stated and agreed upon in the September 22 meeting.

In this meeting, objections were raised to a suggestion by Dr. Judd to include "minority and ethnic politics" as a component of the urban politics position. The view was stated that these specialties lacked academic respectability, and that they might attract the "wrong" kinds of applicants. The faculty agreed to leave out any mention that the teaching of minority or ethnic politics might be desired.

The Department Chairperson appointed and chaired a four-member search

committee. The Committee's responsibilities were to review all applications, and to recommend to the Department candidates to be interviewed. According to University policy, two candidates would normally be interviewed for each position. The Department considered 107 applications for the two assistant professor positions, and 24 applications for the associate professor position.

On January 22, 1981, the Search Committee, at a meeting of the full faculty, presented the files of three top-ranked assistant level candidates to the Department. One of these candidates was Lawrence Mosqueda. The faculty voted unanimously to invite each of these applicants for personal interviews. Subsequently, a fourth candidate was also invited to interview.

Throughout the entire search process, all applicant folders were available to members of the Departmental faculty. Department faculty members were specifically invited to carefully review all of the materials provided by the applicants. All faculty members had an opportunity to interview each candidate, look over all the files, request additional information which they felt was necessary, and to cast an independent vote when final decisions were made.

It is clear from events surrounding the interviewing process that Dr. Mosqueda was discriminated against on the basis of race and national origin. Before and during the interview process, many faculty members made racist remarks, or indicated clearly prejudicial opinions. Most faculty did not make an attempt to closely analyze his qualifications.

At the time Dr. Mosqueda was interviewed, he was the only urban candidate being interviewed, though an additional urban politics candidate was later designated for an interview. Professor Mosqueda had unusually strong credentials for a beginning-level position. He had taught a wide variety of courses, including urban politics, American politics, public policy, Marxist political thought, minority politics and many others.

At the time of his interview, Dr. Mosqueda was revising his dissertation so that it could be submitted to major publishers as a book manuscript. At the time, he already had demonstrated a record of scholarly activity; he had presented four conference papers, was to chair a panel at an upcoming convention, and submitted an article for publication to a refereed journal. In addition to the book manuscript in preparation, he was planning to write an urban politics book with two senior scholars in the field. He was considered by the two urban scholars in the Department to be one of the top young scholars in the field today. During Dr. Mosqueda's interview, Drs. Meranto and Judd were the two senior (and only) urban scholars in the Department, but Dr. Meranto was not asked for his judgment, and claims were made that Dr. Mosqueda's dissertation was not in the urban field. The dissertation on "Chicanos, Catholicism and Political Ideology" would necessarily be considered "urban" within the political science discipline. It was approved by several urban scholars at the University of Washington.

Dr. Mosqueda had five years' teaching experience at the time of the interview, at three different universities. His teaching evaluations were uniformly outstanding.

Despite his credentials, Dr. Mosqueda was not offered a position. Most of the Department faculty voted to make an offer to a white male candidate who did not have a completed dissertation. This candidate had very little teaching experience and had not held a faculty position. He had no scholarly activities to his credit.

On February 18, the Departmental faculty voted to offer positions to two white male candidates. Both were specialists in the field specified as "national institutions" in the job advertisement. Students at the meeting voted overwhelmingly for Dr. Mosqueda, and most considered him to be strongest of all the candidates who had interviewed.

Before the faculty vote, Dr. Judd had approached the Dean, and expressed concerns about affirmative action violations. He held many meetings with the Dean in an attempt to get the University to intervene, or at least to look into the matter. At no time was a serious attempt made to investigate the events in the Department with a view to enforcing affirmative action guidelines. In response to the University's persistent refusal to even investigate the situation, Dr. Judd, on March 2, resigned as Departmental chairperson (effective June 30). The University's response to his resignation, and to Dr. Mosqueda's formal affirmative action complaints to the Affirmative Action Officer, was to appoint one of the individuals who led the fight against Dr. Mosqueda as acting Chairperson for the 1981-82 academic year. Subsequently, the Chancellor ordered that the Affirmative Action Officer's report be held in secrecy, and that the University's affirmative action process be aborted.

Throughout this period, Dr. Mosqueda made numerous attempts to get the University to follow its own affirmative action procedures. On March 25, the Chancellor asked Dr. Mosqueda to meet with him. When Dr. Mosqueda indicated that he would like to do that, but would like to have an attorney present, the Chancellor indicated that Dr. Mosqueda's request to have an attorney present aborted the University's own procedures, and that therefore the Chancellor personally had ordered them stopped.

This directive was given even though the University's own procedures do not require that a complainant meet with the Chancellor. Further, the University's affirmative action procedures require that the affirmative action officer make an attempt to reconcile the differences among the parties, and that if these differences cannot be reconciled, that the affirmative action officer proceed with a hearing before the University's Affirmative Action Board. The University's procedures do not specify an opportunity for the Chancellor to personally intervene to abort the proceedings.

The University acted in other ways to insure that a fair investigation would not be conducted. The Affirmative Action Officer, after taking statements from both sides in the controversy, gave copies of all materials of the affirmative action complaints to the respondents, but refused copies to the complainants. The Officer also turned over files supplied to him/her from the Department of Political Science to one of the respondents, without notifying the Chairperson. In part because these actions revealed consistent bad faith by the University, Drs. Mosqueda and Judd retained counsel, and a scheduled EEOC hearing was canceled. The EEOC granted Dr. Mosqueda the right to sue.

On June 30, 1981, Dr. Mosqueda filed suit in federal district court against the University of Denver seeking $1 million in compensatory and $10 million in punitive damages. He also initiated suit against ten individual faculty and administrators. Dr. Judd also initiated suit, seeking $1 million in compensatory and $5 million in punitive damages, as well as damages from individual faculty and administrators.

The litigation in behalf of Dr. Mosqueda rests on three separate but related facts. First, his credentials are far superior to those of the white male candidate whom the Department voted to hire. Apparently, the University's understanding of affirmative action is that even if a minority candidate has stronger credentials an offer might not be forthcoming. Second, a pattern of unprofessional conduct showing racist motives occurred during the interview process. Third, the University's affirmative action rules are so inadequate that they do not meet the spirit or the letter of Federal statutes. For example, the University's affirmative action rules apparently exclude job applicants from standing to initiate complaints.

Drs. Mosqueda and Judd retained as counsel noted attorney Leonard Weinglass, who represented several of the Chicago Seven. The litigants have made a

commitment to designate most of any settlement or judgment against the University (after expenses) to set up a fund which can be used to finance other cases involving unfair employment practices against women and minorities. The focus will be primarily but not exclusively on universities. If you have questions about this case or would like to request further information, contact the authors of this paper.

VI. Some Political Lessons

In conclusion, we pose the questions: Why is it that so few political science departments have a racially, sexually and politically diverse faculty? Why is it that chairpersons such as Professors Judd and Dolbeare who have attempted to recruit a racially, sexually and politically diverse faculty have been forced to resign? We have suggested that the answers to these two questions lie in the entrenched nature of racism in American society and in the role of university faculty as protectors of and apologists for the status quo.

One of the lessons of this study indicates that demonstrations and protests are not sufficient. There were plenty of these at the University of Washington. But five years after Dr. Munoz's complaint, the federal government decided in his favor. However, there was no follow-up; the case was isolated and there was no long-term strategy for gaining satisfactory results.

At the University of Denver, a permanent coalition is being built. The Justice in Employment Committee has incorporated, and has committed its energies (and money gained in a court decision or settlement) to helping women, minorities, radicals, or others, to finance court cases or take political action to achieve justice in university employment decisions.

Out of this case, it is hoped a coalition will be formed which will exchange information on cases across the country so that individuals who suffer discrimination

will not be isolated. Only through this means will the monopoly of senior, white male faculty in universities be broken. The diversity of American culture and political views can be represented only when tenured faculty cannot hide behind a semi-secret, carefully guarded "confidential" process of faculty appointments.

Given the self-perpetuating nature of the entrenched tenured faculty, fundamental changes cannot be expected in a department (or university) which only appeals to their "good will" or "fair judgment." At the University of Denver, increased resources made available through research funds allowed faculty unprecedented perks: travel, increased budgets for phones and other expenses, time off from courses. But in the end, the prospect of change was too threatening.

Our case suggests that change cannot come exclusively from within. Participation from students and community representatives is necessary; otherwise alternative views cannot be effectively expressed.

In addition, some aspects of the present tenure system must be reconsidered. The tenure system has created a white, male academic elite; it offers little incentive for quality research and teaching and ties up academic positions so that true social diversity on university faculties is almost impossible to achieve. Tenured faculty tend to be committed to tradition and resist attempts to introduce new curricula not representative of their own interests.

The costs for those who question white male dominance is high: the firing of non-tenured staff, the loss of promotion opportunities, and limits on professional mobility. At the University of Denver some of those alleging discrimination in Professor Mosqueda's recruitment were labelled as "crazy." As a result, most faculty will not stand up to protest discriminatory practices. The complicity of faculty in covering up discrimination in university hiring and promotion decisions is <u>at least suggested</u> by the lack of success experienced by Title VII litigants challenging university employment practices -- unless it is

assumed that most of those filing suits are not qualified.[29]

All of this suggests that institutional racism is embedded in faculty recruitment practices in American universities. Any attempt to alter the status quo will be met by strong opposition. "Credentials," "poise," "pleasant personality," are euphemisms for the reflexive desire of white male faculty members to recruit candidates who share their values and lifestyles. Only female and minority job candidates who such faculty view as socially and politically acceptable are likely to be offered employment.

APPENDIX

The two cases discussed in this paper are representative of what, we believe, is a pattern of repression in American universities. We are cataloguing cases of "academic repression" and have sketched some representative cases below.

I. Freedom of Political Speech:

A. Stolberg was terminated for writing a letter protesting the suspension of students at a nearby university and offering the mediation services of the AAUP. Southern Connecticut State College.

B. Rozeman was terminated for sitting in at an ROTC building, asking the University to make a stronger statement on the Cambodian invasion and the Kent State incident and participating on behalf of students in negotiating with University administration. University of Nebraska.

C. Adamian, a tenured associate professor, was terminated for protesting the Cambodian invasion and the Kent State incident by shouting at ROTC cadets during Governor's Day Ceremony, making loud noises and joining individuals on the stadium field during the ROTC drills. University of Nevada (Reno).

D. Duke, a teaching assistant, was terminated from her teaching position for using "profane" language during a talk to freshmen and for bringing a "subculture group" into the University orientation program by organizing a meeting held in violation of University rules. North Texas State.

E. Keddie was terminated for criticizing United States involvement in Vietnam, social policies with respect to poor people, organizing protest activities, being faculty advisor for SDS, and serving as counsel for students charged with disciplinary violations. Penn State.

II. Freedom to Criticize the University Administration:

A. Markwell was terminated for protesting that: class time was being reduced by 20 percent for chemistry students; 50 percent of students were required to receive a C or better; the new chair of the chemistry department was not, in Markwells' view, qualified. San Antonio College.

B. Mabey was terminated for objecting in a speech to the faculty senate to the college president's characterization in the Los Angeles Times of young faculty as "punks" and as a "jerk." Fresno State.

C. Lindsey was questioned by the police and then terminated for compiling and mailing a questionnaire to all faculty concerning various aspects of faculty morale and administrative practices. University of Georgia.

D. Kaprelian was terminated for criticizing the existing curriculum as "behind the times" and "inferior." Texas Women's University.

E. Starsky was terminated for protesting the arrest of students at the University of Arizona; cancelling a scheduled class to speak at the rally; handing out leaflets on campus; insulting other faculty; and encouraging students to occupy a campus building. Arizona State.

F. Franklin was supported by faculty and the Dean for a position and was considered a leading scholar in his field. The Board of Regents refused to offer him a position based upon the fact that Franklin, a Marxist, would pose a "substantial threat of material disruption" to the University. University of Colorado, Boulder.

G. Megill was terminated for combining his course with another instructor; criticizing the University as authoritarian; criticizing a colleague's termination; and for interrupting a panel on student dissent at the Yale Club. University of Florida.

H. Carr was terminated for protesting the coercing of graduate students to participate in religious activities; protesting the prescribed textbooks used in introductory courses; and for presenting Marxist points of view in class. University of Akron.

I. Hostrop was terminated for circulating a proposal among his administrative staff, which was made public, proposing changes in the college's ethnic studies program. He was asked to resign, refused and was fired. Prairie State Junior College.

J. Bradford was terminated for protesting to the college president, during a faculty meeting, the termination of several faculty members. The Chair of her department characterized her behavior, in public, as "unprofessional." She threatened to sue and was terminated. Tarrant County Junior College.

K. Roseman was terminated for alleging that the acting chair has suppressed a candidate's application. She expressed these views, at the invitation of the Dean, at a faculty meeting. Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

III. Freedom to Refuse to Obey Unreasonable Administrative Requirements:

A. Lyman, a tenured professor, was dismissed for refusing to cooperate with a special university evaluation of his professional and personal conduct. No charges were made of any impropriety. He wrote a public letter of protest and was fired. Idaho State University.

B. Hillis was ordered by his department chair to give a "B" to a female student whose work he had never evaluated and who had never attended class. He was terminated. Stephen F. Austin State University.

C. Stewart, a faculty member, was terminated for refusing to submit to a psychiatric exam, was assigned to work in the library, did so for six

weeks and then stopped doing so and was fired. San Mateo College.

D. Hander was terminated for refusing to shave off his beard. San Jacinto Junior College.

IV. Freedom of Political Activity:

A. Goss was terminated for campaigning on behalf of her husband for a seat on the local Junior College Board of Regents. San Jacinto Junior College.

B. Smith was terminated for supporting a Democratic candidate in a State senatorial election and criticizing, in conjunction with the College Young Democrats, the record of the Republican candidate. Dixie Junior College.

C. Shaw and Winn, tenured faculty, boycotted graduation and a faculty workshop to protest the college's refusal to recognize a faculty union. They did not submit the required letter of apology implicitly recognizing their misconduct and were terminated. Frederick Community College.

D. Jackson was terminated as a teaching assistant without a hearing based upon the allegation of the state Attorney General that he purchased twenty-seven boxes of ammunition and delivered them to members of the Black community. University of Kansas.

V. Freedom to Teach:

A. Hetrick was terminated for emphasizing "student responsibility and freedom" rather than teaching "fundamentals" and following "conventional teaching patterns." Eastern Kentucky University.

B. Clark was terminated for, pursuant to student requests, emphasizing sex in a health class, counseling an excessive number of students instead of referring them to professional counsellors and for criticizing other faculty in front of students. Northern Illinois University.

VI. Freedom of Political Affiliation:

A. Cooper was terminated for being a member of the Progressive Labor Party; stating that he was a Marxist in class and for distributing a handout on Marx to his class. University of Arkansas, Little Rock.

NOTES

1. Conditions of Black America, 1981, Urban League.

2. See for example, the Ethnic Studies Bibliography (Center for International Studies: University of Pittsburgh, 1975).

3. Melvin Tumin, "Some Social Consequences of Research on Race Relations" in Hans Peter Dreitzel, Recent Sociology (New York, 1969), p. 254, quoted in Ira Katznelson, Black Men, White Cities (University of Chicago, 1973), p. 10. Emphasis in original.

4. See Philip Meranto and Lawrence Mosqueda, "Toward Revolution in Urban America: Problems and Prospects," American Political Science Association Convention, September 3, 1979, Washington, D.C.

5. For an elaboration on these cases see Alan P. Sindler, Bakke, DeFunis, and Minority Admissions (New York: Longman, 1978).

6. For example, see Philip Meranto and William Nelson, Electing Black Mayors (Columbus: Ohio State University Press).

7. Stokely Carmichael and Charles Hamilton, Black Power (New York: Random House, 1967), p. 1.

8. Michael Banton and Jonathan Harwood, The Race Concept (New York: Praeger, 1975), cited in Reid Luhman and Stuart Gilman, Race and Ethnic Relations (Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1980), p. 36.

9. James and Grace Boggs, Racism and the Class Struggle (New York: Monthly Review, 1970).

10. Tomas Almaguer, "Historical Notes on Chicano Oppression: The Dialectics of Racial and Class Domination in North America," Aztlan (5:1 and 2, 1974).

11. Robert Blauner, Racial Oppression in America (New York: Harper and Row, 1972).

12. Eric Williams, Capitalism and Slavery (New York: Capricorn, 1966).

13. These steps are largely from the work of Almaguer, "Historical Notes."

14. Almaguer, p. 28-29.

15. See Lawrence J. Mosqueda, "Chicanos, Catholicism and Political Ideology," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Washington, 1979, chapter 2.

16. Almaguer, p. 43.

17. Ibid, p. 29.

18. See Richard Hofstadter and Walter Metzger, The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States (New York: Columbia, 1955) and Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University (New York: Random House, 1962). Also see generally, Ralph Miliband, The State in Capitalist Society (New York: Basic Books, 1969).

19. Lowrie J. Daly, The Medieval University (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961); Charles Homer Haskins, The Rise of Universities New York: Smith, 1940).

20. Hofstadter, p. 411-416, 446, 450. See Thorstein Veblen, The Higher Learning in America: A Memorandum of the Conduct of Universities by Business Men (New York: Viking, 1918).

21. See generally, James Ridgeway, The Closed Corporation (New York: Random House, 1968).

22. See "The Pentagon in the Ivory Tower" 45 Progressive 25-30 (June, 1981).

23. Hofstadter, p. 124.

24. Ibid, p. 231.

25. Ibid, p. 286.

26. Ibid, p. 420, 421.

27. Ibid, p. 477.

28. See Appendix.

29. Richard Yurko, "Judicial Recognition of Academic Collective Interests: A New Approach to Faculty Title VII Litigation" 60 Boston University Law Review 474, 482 (1980).